

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

DOUGLAS BRUCE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:23-cv-02253-MSN-tmp
JURY DEMAND

CITY OF MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE,

Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is the Chief Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 37, “Report”), entered April 14, 2025. The Report recommends granting Defendant City of Memphis’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 21) on the grounds that Plaintiff’s claims are barred by the statute of limitations. (ECF No. 37 at PageID 279–86.) Plaintiff had fourteen (14) days to file objections. (*Id.* at PageID 286.) Plaintiff has not submitted any objections.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district court duties to magistrate judges. *See United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing *Gomez v. United States*, 490 U.S. 858, 869–70 (1989)); *see also Baker v. Peterson*, 67 F. App’x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). For dispositive matters, “[t]he district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1). After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the magistrate judge’s proposed findings or

recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district court is not required to review—under a *de novo* or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge’s findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *See id.* at 151.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Having reviewed the Report and the entire record in this matter, the Court agrees with the Chief Magistrate Judge’s analysis and conclusions. No objections having been filed, the Court finds no clear error in the Report.

The Chief Magistrate Judge expressly warned that:

WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER BEING SERVED WITH A COPY OF THIS REPORT AND RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION, ANY PARTY MAY SERVE AND FILE SPECIFIC WRITTEN OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. ANY PARTY MAY RESPOND TO ANOTHER PARTY’S OBJECTIONS WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER BEING SERVED WITH A COPY. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2); L.R. 72.1(g)(2). FAILURE TO FILE OBJECTIONS WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS MAY CONSTITUTE A WAIVER AND/OR FORFEITURE OF OBJECTIONS, EXCEPTIONS, AND FURTHER APPEAL.

(ECF No. 37 at PageID 286.)

Despite this clear warning, no objections were filed within the allotted time.

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 37) in its entirety. Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 21) is hereby **GRANTED**. Plaintiff’s claims are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** as time-barred.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 12th day of May, 2025.

s/ Mark S. Norris

MARK S. NORRIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE